



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,528	09/29/2003	Lixiao Wang	10177-234	1834
20583	7590	04/14/2005	EXAMINER	
JONES DAY 222 EAST 41ST ST NEW YORK, NY 10017			GHERBI, SUZETTE JAIME J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

3738

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/673,528		WANG, LIXIAO	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Suzette J Gherbi		3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 50-89 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 50-89 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 50-89 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:
2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claim 1 is, drawn to "A stent", classified in class 623, subclass 1.42
 - II. Claims 50-89 are drawn to "Methods of Making", classified in class 427, subclass 2.24.
3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (*noting claim 69*) such as dipping the stent into a polymer solution and afterwards removing the center portion; or providing a protective cover to the center portion and then dipping only the ends.

Art Unit: 3738

4. Applicant's election with traverse in the reply filed on 1/19/05 is acknowledged.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no burden and that the inventions are "intertwined". This is not found persuasive because as noted in the prior office communication dated 11/19/04, these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

6. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 50-89 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3738

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolting et al. 6,488,701. Nolting et al. discloses the invention as claimed noting figure 8 comprising: A stent (60) with a main body having a first end portion a second end portion, (66, 68) a middle portion, wherein the first end portion comprises an edge and wherein at least a portion of the edge has a biocompatible coating, (see col. 5, lines 60-63 and col. 10, lines 1-12) wherein the coating comprises a polymer or a drug, (see col. 7, lines 52-56) and wherein the middle portion is free of the coating (col. 10, lines 5-9); with the entire edge being coated. However Nolting does not state the term "directly thereon". Applicant has not disclosed that having the polymer or drug applied "directly thereon" solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and because Nolting utilizes polymer materials only on the ends (as indicated in embodiment 8) it appears that the coating of Nolting would perform equally as well and is deemed to be a design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art of Nolting.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 1/19/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contends that Nolting does not suggest a coating which directly covers or contactsthe surface of the end poriton. The examiner has reviewed

Art Unit: 3738

applicant's specification and notes that the only mention of "directly" ([0051]) is mentioned in with respect to applying a drug carrying gel like material which can be applied over an existing coating "18" or directly to the stent. Applicant disclosure does point out any criticality as to why one option is better than the other. Nolling embodiment in figure 8, col. 9, lines 66-67 and col. 10, lines 1-12 has stated and illustrated that the coating (65) is either on one or both ends. It is obvious by not mentioning the middle portion has the coating that it is coating free.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

11. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3738

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzette J. Jackson whose work schedule is Monday-Friday 9-6:30 off every other Friday and whose telephone number is 571-272-4751.

13. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306.

14. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.



Suzette J-J Gherbi
13 April 2005